industry and to the very life of the nation, and that is a mistake which must never be repeated. No civilised country in the world spent less, or even so little on agriculture,, either directly or indirectly, as we did. I ventured to call attention to this in 1909, but inasmuch as my statement was mixed up with a good deal of controversial matter, it was not in the least acceptable to the very people for whom it was designed. Between 70 and 80 per cent, of our staple cereal for consumption has been imported yearly, and at the present moment / *want the country to know our food stocks are low, alarmingly low*—lower than they have been within recollection. . . . *It is essential, therefore, for the safety of the nation . . . that we should put forth immediately every effort to increase production for this year's harvest and the next, and that we should do it immediately.* . . ."

I appealed for support for the hard work being done by the Minister of Agriculture, and indicated some of the features of the problem with which he was faced. The difficulties in the way of increasing cultivation, I pointed out, were not solely those caused by labour shortage, serious though this was. The greatest obstacle was the timidity of the farmer when it came to cutting up his pasture.

" He has been caught twice with too much arable land, and caught very badly—

once in 1880
and the other time in 1890—and then he had years
of anxiety, depression, and insolvency, his savings
completely absorbed, and very often he himself for
years waterlogged by debt. There is no memory
as tenacious as that of the tiller of the soil, and the
furrows are still in the agricultural mind. Those